

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/654,320	09/01/2000	Jaideep Srivastava	P3944	5747

24739 7590 07/01/2004

CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY  
PO BOX 187  
AROMAS, CA 95004

EXAMINER

LEZAK, ARRIENNE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/654,320	Applicant(s) SRIVASTAVA ET AL.	
	Examiner Arrienne M. Lezak	Art Unit 2143	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 21 May 2004 has been entered.
2. Examiner notes that no new claims have been added, no claims have been cancelled and Claims 1 & 13 have been amended.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,935,207 to Logue in view of US Patent 5,796,952 to Davis.
5. Regarding Claims 1 & 13, Logue discloses a data-collection system for collecting data about a user through monitoring user interaction on a data-packet-network comprising: a proxy server connected to the data-packet-network for providing user access to the proxy services and for monitoring user access and interaction with those

Art Unit: 2143

services; parsing applicable data resulting from the user activity and transactions; a dedicated server interface connected to the data-packet-network for providing user access to the proxy services; and a software application running on the proxy server for collecting and storing data obtained as a result of active user-interaction with the proxy services in a secure an organized fashion; and incorporating the recorded data for the purpose of creating a multifaceted user profile, (Abstract; Col. 2, lines 19-46; Col. 5, lines 10-30; Col. 11, lines 35-67; and Col. 12, lines 1-40).

6. Logue does not specifically disclose the continued monitoring of post-access online user activity and transactions, (as required by Newly Amended pending Claims 1 & 13).

7. Davis discloses a method and apparatus for tracking client interaction with a network resource and creating client profiles and resource database, (Title & Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by Applicant to incorporate the monitoring technique of Davis into the Logue method. The motivation to combine is found within Logue's use of a "site tracking list" which organizes data so as to provide hit tracking information to remote site administrators, (Col. 5, lines 10-30). As Logue already teaches the monitoring and storage of some user interaction for purposes of generating reports of the same, it would have been obvious to monitor and store all user interaction for purposes of generating various other types of reports. Thus, Claims 1 & 13 are unpatentable over the combined teachings of Logue in view of Davis.

Art Unit: 2143

8. Regarding all dependant claims, Examiner notes that the teachings of Logue in view of Davis relative to Claims 1 & 13 are assumed incorporated therein.

9. Regarding Claims 2 and 14, Logue discloses a data-collection system wherein the data-packet-network is the Internet network, (Col. 2, lines 19-46; Col. 3, lines 66-67; and Col. 4, lines 1-2).

10. Regarding Claim 3, Logue discloses a data-collection system wherein the proxy server and a dedicated server interface are maintained by a same service-providing entity, (Col. 4, lines 2-19 and Col. 6, lines 42-59).

11. Regarding Claim 4, Logue discloses a data-collection network wherein the dedicated server interface is dedicated to providing cobrand services to users of a cobrand partner, (Fig. 5A and 5B; Col. 6, lines 62-67; and Col. 7, lines 1-43).

12. Regarding Claim 5, Logue discloses a data-collection system wherein the proxy services include a data-collection, aggregation and summary service, (Abstract; Col. 5, lines 10-30; Col. 9, lines 20-67; Col. 10, lines 1-67; and Col. 11, lines 1-34).

13. Regarding Claim 6, Logue discloses a data-collection system wherein there are a plurality of dedicated server interfaces, individual ones of such interfaces dedicated to individual ones of a plurality of participating cobrand partners, (Col. 2, lines 19-46 and Col. 4, lines 14-19).

14. Regarding Claim 7, Logue discloses a data-collection system wherein the software application collects demographic data, account-information data, and on-line behavior data, (Abstract; Col. 3, lines 38-44; and Col. 5, lines 13-30).

15. Regarding Claim 8, Logue discloses a data-collection system wherein the collected data about a user is used to construct a multifaceted user profile, (Abstract; Col. 3, lines 38-44; and Col. 5, lines 13-30).

16. Regarding Claim 9, Logue discloses a data-collection system wherein the data-collection is performed in an entirely automated fashion, (Col. 8, lines 45-67; Col. 9, lines 1-18; and Col. 12, lines 1-4).

17. Regarding Claim 10, Logue discloses a data-collection system wherein additional data obtained through non-automated method is added to the data collected automatically in order to increase the scope of a multifaceted user profile, (Col. 5, lines 10-30).

18. Regarding Claim 11, Logue discloses a data-collection system wherein assembly of the multifaceted user profile is automated, (Col. 8, lines 45-67; Col. 9, lines 1-18; and Col. 12, lines 1-4).

19. Regarding Claim 12, Logue discloses a data-collection system wherein the assembled multifaceted user profile is periodically updated in an automated fashion, (Col. 8, lines 45-67; Col. 9, lines 1-18; and Col. 12, lines 1-4).

20. Regarding Claims 15 and 16, Logue discloses a data-collection method wherein the monitoring step includes the monitoring of transactions including purchases, site registrations, and orders for summary data, (Claim 15); and the user activity includes activity at an interfacing server, (Claim 16), (Col. 2, lines 19-46; Col. 5, lines 10-67; and Col. 6, lines 1-59).

21. Regarding Claims 17 and 18, Logue discloses a data-collection method wherein the recording of applicable data is done to a data repository external (Claim 17), or internal (Claim 18), to the server recording the data, (Col. 4, lines 14-19, 53-57 and Col. 6, lines 42-46).

22. Thus, Claims 2-12 and 14-18 are unpatentable over the combined the combined teachings of Logue in view of Davis.

### ***Response to Arguments***

23. Applicant's arguments filed 21 May 2004, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the Amendment avoids such references or objections.

24. Thus, as Examiner has completely addressed Applicant's amendment, and finding Applicant's arguments do not show how the Amendment avoids such references or objections, Examiner hereby rejects Newly Amended Claims 1 & 13 and Original Claims 2-12 & 14-18 in their entirety.



Art Unit: 2143

***Conclusion***


25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arrienne M. Lezak whose telephone number is (703)-305-0717. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (703)-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)-305-3718.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-305-6121.

Arrienne M. Lezak  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

AML

  
**DAVID WILEY**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100